

ment among the powers, which will for a time neutralize the jealousy between them that might lead to war. The only interest we have in the matter is what influence, if any, the conference may have upon the future relations of the great powers to the Orient and future activities in the Pacific Ocean.

Next to the Philippine question, probably nothing has recently been the subject of more comment by contemporary journals on the mainland than

The Samoan Muddle

the Samoan Muddle. It is a subject that must naturally be of great interest to home readers. It is, therefore, discussed at greater length elsewhere in these columns.

Is it possible that ecclesiastical jealousies, at this the very dawn of the twentieth century, can still wield an influence so patent as to cause sanguinary conflicts and put great powers by the ears? It seems so. It is pretty generally conceded that the struggle between the English Protestant missionaries and the Catholic priests, for paramount influence in native affairs is responsible for the whole thing.

It seems that Mataafa is under Catholic influence while Malietoa Tanu is the candidate for the throne of the English missionaries. Malietoa the elder was never able to govern the islands although nominally king. His jurisdiction extended only over a very small district in the vicinity of Apia. The adherents of Mataafa outnumbered those of the former many times and have for years refused to pay taxes to the Government of the reigning king. It is conceded, in the election following the death of Malietoa the elder, that Mataafa received the more votes and should have been declared king if the will of the people had been taken into consideration.

It is openly charged from German sources, with considerable showing of evidence, that Judge Chambers was directly under the influence of the Protestant missionaries and gave his decision in favor of Malietoa Tanu, on the plea of "right by descent," to assist his friends in gaining the paramount political influence. If Justice Chambers did thus connive to defeat the popular will in Samoa he and his missionary conspirators become responsible for a very serious chapter of casualties; i. e. the loss of many good Samoan lives, the killing of a number of brave American and English naval officers and men, besides the ridiculous spectacle of the war ships of two of the greatest powers on earth bombarding defenseless native huts and slaughtering people who were fighting for just representation, a principle for which these two powers, above all others, stand sponsor.

Much is hoped for from the deliberations of the Samoan Commission but it is not best to be too sanguine concerning the outcome. All the members must agree to make the work of the Commission effective. Germany cannot well recede from the position she has taken and if the American and English representatives decide to sustain Justice Chambers the situation will probably remain as it is. If on the contrary his decision is overruled and Mataafa is installed king there will be peace, for the Malietoa Tanu party is not strong enough to carry on a successful revolution without the aid of British and American gunboats.

At all events one thing is certain; the tripartite compact is an absurd farce. It is fraught with danger to the friendly relations of the Great Powers and the advantages are not worth the risk. On the principle that sovereignty or the establishing of protectorates over distant lands, should follow the channel of colonization and

commercial supremacy, would it not be a matter of right as well as of good policy to permit Germany to annex the islands after the other two powers had selected suitable sites for naval and coaling stations?

Under the Newland resolution President Mc-

The President's Power

tion that he has interposed the authority conferred upon him to stop the forthcoming election. This is not said in criticism of the local government for ordering the election. It is difficult to conceive how they could have avoided it acting as they did also under the Newland resolution which provides for the continuance of Hawaiian laws at the discretion of the President of the United States. It must be as much a relief to the local government as it is to the people that President McKinley has used his discretionary power in this instance.

At the present moment there are no politics in Hawaii. An election of a Senate and House of Representatives would have been a farce—an affair without issue or possible interest to anyone. Even under the patched-up oath required for registration the election could not have obtained full representation. It was in itself a farce. Yet it was the only thing that could have been done under the circumstances. If the election had been held old local party differences and race animosities must of necessity have been stirred up, thus putting off the time when all those of Hawaiian birth, of whatever color, and their affiliations, may work with unanimity in public affairs.

It may be audacious so early to forecast the future but the time will surely come when combined Hawaiian influences, in cohesion, will be called upon to repel the evil of carpet-bagism. When this time comes it is needless to say that all Hawaiians who have heretofore refused allegiance to the Hawaiian Republic will take the oath of allegiance to the United States to protect their own interests. It was inevitable, that, in the past, lines were sharply drawn while there was a possible chance for the restoration of the monarchy. But these issues are dead. Let them sleep peacefully in the grave. New issues will confront us soon enough.

It is not at all probable that President McKinley, in making his order to stop the election, took any of these things into consideration. Therefore, it is far more significant, inasmuch as it reflects the opinion of the administration, that American laws will shortly be extended to these islands, thus doing away with the present uncertainty and conflict between the Constitution of Hawaii and that of the United States.

The Australian colonies are to be congratulated upon at last hitting upon

The Australian Federation

a plan of federation. The subject has been agitated for many years. But failure has heretofore followed every effort to bring the matter to a head. In the present instance the question was put to a vote of the people, in each of the colonies, and was carried by a two-thirds majority in all of them excepting Queensland. But it is thoroughly understood by statesmen and politicians that the vote was lost there only because of carelessness in making out the specifications submitted to the people. As the consensus of opinion is there likewise, apparently, in favor of federation it is hoped another election will also bring Queensland into the compact.



B. F. DILLINGHAM,
Hawaii's Great Promoter. (See page 6.)

Lord Beresford and China.

The unexpected and unwelcome publication of a French and Belgian prospectus of a loan of about \$22,500,000 for the construction of a railway from Peking to Han-kow has again drawn attention to the China question. In the teeth of British opposition, Russia and France (for Belgium is merely in China as a Russian cat's-paw) have succeeded in securing the construction of the main line of communication across the Yangtse Valley. Fresh attention is drawn to the situation in China, and the report of Lord Charles Beresford is anticipated with keen interest. This report, which extends to some four hundred pages, will be published by the Harpers simultaneously in England and the United States. I have had the opportunity of perusing the book, and though of course its contents cannot be divulged, I may say that students of high politics, and the general public, will, for the first time, have the China question put before them in a coherent and connected form. The narrative is deeply interesting, and the plea for the maintenance of the open door is sustained in a measured sequence of fact and argument that will appeal to the conscience as well as to the interests of the Anglo-Saxon people. Lord Charles deeply feels the ignominious reversal of British traditions which has characterized our treatment of China. There was a time when the hereditary policy of Britain was to befriend weak nations. That is ancient history. England has taken what does not belong to her in China, under threats of guns and ships, for no better reason than that the military powers of Europe were doing the same.

Lord Charles Beresford has struck a note in his book which will appeal to the better sense of the English-speaking world, although the money-mongers and cosmopolitan financiers may ridicule, as is their wont, the higher plane of thought and feeling from which Lord Charles discusses the whole China problem. The work is a most laborious, interesting, and successful effort to bring together all the information obtainable. The interviews with the various viceroys and the expression of the opinion of the educated Chinese, which are reported in Lord Charles' book, give quite a new idea of the moral and intellectual possibilities of China as a nation.—*London Correspondent of Harper's Weekly.*